

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                        | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR  | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/398,897                             | 09/20/1999     | RENJI YANG            | 0109015/016         | 1629             |
| 24573 7                                | 590 07/29/2004 |                       | EXAMINER            |                  |
| BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC<br>PO BOX 1135 |                | HAYES, ROBERT CLINTON |                     |                  |
| CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135                 |                |                       | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| ,                                      |                |                       | 1647                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Advisory Action | 09/398,897             | YANG ET AL. |
|-----------------|------------------------|-------------|
| ,               | Examiner               | Art Unit    |
|                 | Robert C. Haves, Ph.D. | 1647        |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Application No.

Applicant(s)

THE REPLY FILED 14 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

| condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  |      |
|---|------|
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]  |      |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.   |      |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).   | . li |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extensified have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extensified under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ion  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>14 June 2004</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  |      |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:   |      |
| (a) Ithey raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);   |      |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  |      |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  | 9    |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.   |      |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .   |      |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):   |      |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   |      |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.   |      |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  |      |
| 7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  |      |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |      |
| Claim(s) allowed: none.   |      |
| Claim(s) objected to: none.   |      |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4,5,12,15 and 16</u> .  |      |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .  |      |
| 8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  |      |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)   |      |
| 10. Other:  |      |
| CEK   |      |

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the proposed claim amendments broaden the scope of the claims to include any cell culture, versus only adhesion cultures, and also eliminates a "culturing" step before the transfection step; thereby, requiring further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments have already been extensively addressed in the previous Office actions, or are directed to claim amendments not entered; thereby, being moot..

ROBERT C. HAYES, PH.D. PATENT EXAMINER

2